



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/857,600	09/10/2001	Ludo Adriaensen	016782-0230	6512

7590

12/26/2002

Glenn Law
Foley & Lardner
Washington Harbour Suite 500
3000 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20007-5109

EXAMINER

GRAY, JILL M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1774

DATE MAILED: 12/26/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/857,600	Applicant(s) ADRIAENSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Jill M Gray	Art Unit 1774	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 6, and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Creps 4, 358, 887.

Creps teaches a coated steel wire comprising a steel core that is covered with an intermediate coating layer and immediately thereupon with a polymer, said polymer being a polyester as required by claims 1 and 8. See abstract. In addition, Creps teaches that the intermediate coating layer can be zinc as required by claim 6 and that the coating of the intermediate layer is by the hot-dip method.

Accordingly, Creps anticipates the invention as claimed in claims 1, 6, and 8-9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-5, 7, and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Creps in view of European Patent Publication No. 791,453, (hereinafter Busby) and Great Britain Publication No. 2,077,762 (Sou).

Creps is as set forth above but does not teach that the polymer has a transparent coloring agent or pigment. Busby teaches a polymer coated steel substrate having an intermediate zinc coating and a transparent polymer film coated thereon having an organic coloring media dispersed therein as required by claims 2, 5 and 10. The polymer can be polyethylene terephthalate as required by claims 3-4. In addition, Busby teaches that the coloring media is such that the steel can be decorated or to encapsulate messages or logos. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Creps by including a coloring agent or pigment in the transparent polymer layer to decorate or color the resultant wire. Regarding claim 11, Sou teaches the formation of zinc-coated wire wherein the final rod is wet drawn which gives the rod a smooth bright finish. It would have been obvious to wet draw the wire of Creps to give the resultant wire a smooth bright finish before coating with a polymer film. As to claim 12, Busby teaches in column 1, lines 50-52 that the polymer film can be extruded onto the steel substrate. Regarding claim 7, metal coating of steel substrates is known in the art and the selection of copper or copper alloy is would have been an obvious variant commensurate with the desired properties of the end product. Furthermore, the selection of copper or copper alloy over other metals is not construed to be a matter of invention in the absence of clear factual evidence to the contrary.

Therefore, the prior art teachings of Creps, Busby and Sou would have rendered obvious the invention as claimed in the present claims.

No claims are allowed.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jill M Gray whose telephone number is 703.308.2381. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly can be reached on 703.308.0449. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703.305.5408 for regular communications and 703.305.3599 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/857,600

Page 5

Art Unit: 1774

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703.308.0651.



Jill M Gray
Examiner
Art Unit 1774

jmg
December 22, 2002